TERESA BAŁUK-ULEWICZOWA
The Jagiellonian University, Krakow

THE BAD QUARTO *HAMLET* AND THE POLISH CONNECTION

Over a hundred years ago Israel Gollancz suggested a link between the character of Polonius – Corambis in the "Bad Quarto" of *Hamlet* – and *The Counsellor*, an English translation published in 1598 of *De Optimo Senatore*, a well-known *speculum* book published in Venice in 1568 (2nd edition Basel, 1593) by the Polish humanist Wawrzyniec Grzymała Goślicki (Goslicius).[1] The claim has remained in the realm of hypothesis and speculation, largely because the research undertaken hitherto has been too limited in approach. Only recently has new work and the availability of new documentation and facts enabled progress to be made in the search for a viable answer as to why the character known as "Polonius" in the Second Quarto (Q2 – 1604/5), the 1623 Folio and subsequent editions of *Hamlet* is "Corambis" in Q1, the "Bad Quarto" of 1603.[2]

My solution to this problem, which has perplexed scholars of Q1 ever since the Bad Quarto's discovery in the nineteenth century, is not prejudicial to either the memorial reconstruction theory of the origins of Q1, nor to the revision theory, nor to any of the hybrid explanations deriving from a mixture of these two apparently antagonistic hypotheses. It is independent of the vagaries scholarship is taking in the quest for an an-

[1] Laurentii Grimaldi Goslicii *De Optimo Senatore Libri Duo...*, Venetiis, Apud Iordanum Zilettum, MDLXVIII (in this study referred to as Ven.); and its English translation, *The Counsellor. Exactly Pourtraited in two Bookes...*, Written in Latin, By LAURENTIUS GRIMALDUS, and *consecrated to the Honour of the Polonian Empyre. Newlie translated into English.* London, Imprinted by Richard Bradocke, Anno Salutis Humanae M.D.XC.VIII (referred to in this study as L1598); I. Gollancz, "Résumé of papers delivered on 26 February and 27 April 1904 in the British Academy," in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, London 1904–1905, 199–202; *idem*, "Bits of Timber. Some Observations on Shakespearean Names: 'Shylock', 'Polonius', 'Malvolio'." *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, I. Gollancz (ed.), Oxford 1916, 173–177. See also *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare.* G. Bullough (ed.), 8 vols, London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973, vol. 7, 43–45; K. Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*, London: Methuen, 1977, 168, 245; S. Guttmann, *The Foreign Sources of Shakespeare's Works. An Annotated Bibliography ... with a List of Certain Translations Available to Shakespeare*, New York 1947, 14–15.

[2] I have used the following Shakespeare editions: *Hamlet. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, H. Howard Furness (ed.), vols I & II, New York: Dover Publications, 1963 (referred to in this study as "*Variorum*"); *Hamlet, The Arden Shakespeare*, H. Jenkins (ed.), London and New York: Methuen, 1982; *The Tragedie of HAMLET Prince of Denmarke*, Enfolded Text, http://www.leoyan.com/global-language.com/ENFOLDED/enhamp.php?type=EN, B. Kliman (ed.). For a recent re-evaluation of the "bad quarto" debate see L. Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts. The "Bad" Quartos and Their Contexts,* Cambridge University Press, 1996.

swer how Q1 arose. However, in explaining part of the "why" behind Q1 and Q2 it may throw light on some of the mechanisms involved in the emergence of texts as diverse as Q1, Q2 and F1.

I approach the problem in a series of points of separate but interrelated fields of inquiry building up into a more complex methodology than simple textual analysis, which will enable me to describe the interests and motives that might have determined the name-change from "Polonius" to "Corambis."

1) Textual analysis of passages from L1598 with respect to Polonius's Precepts, which Gollancz claimed echoed Goślicki's treatise, was undertaken in 1960 by J.A. Teslar,[3] who demonstrated parallels at first sight stunning. However, if it is remembered that the material of the Precepts derives from Renaissance commonplaces, the purely philological parallels become less surprising, as I show in a separate study, tracing each of the component parts of Polonius's Precepts to the *Adagia* of Erasmus and Manutius – a set of resources which could have been, and was used by scores of Renaissance writers, particularly of the *specula* or mirror-books.[4] Other Shakespearean critics, as far back as W. L. Rushton, made similar claims for Lyly's *Euphues* as the source of Polonius's Precepts.[5] Thus the results of simple philological comparison are inconclusive, nonetheless they highlight the connection between the text of *Hamlet* (most of all the Q2 version) and the *specula* as a *class* of books, and they also lead to a further observation which I shall discuss in point 9.

2) Few of those who have expressed an opinion on L1598 as a source for Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and the character of Polonius have bothered to read and compare this translation with its Latin original. In fact, L1598 is a bowdlerised version of Goslicius' work, with the suppression of passages presenting Goslicius's arguments for the primacy of the Roman Catholic Church in the affairs of the state, and also his preference of elected to hereditary monarchy.[6] On the other hand, the numerous purely mechanical errors of translation in L1598 suggest that the translation was carried out hastily and without due editorial attention. Coupled with the intriguing inclusion of the original letter dedicatory to a King of Poland deceased for over a quarter-century by 1598, and with the curious inscription on the title page "To the honour of the Polonian Empire," alongside the many laudations of Poland and Polish personalities reproduced from the Latin original, these facts suggest that L1598 was a complimentary publication, offi-

[3] J. A. Teslar, "Shakespeare's Worthy Counsellor," in *Sacrum Poloniae Millennium*, vol. 7, Roma 1960, 9–144; see 23–24, 84–85; cf. T. J. Bałukówna, *"De Optimo Senatore" Wawrzyńca Goślickiego i jego oddziaływanie w Anglii*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Jagiellonian University of Krakow, 1979, 235–249; T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "Polonius, Poland, and Political Theory: A Juxtaposition of the Q2 Precepts with Alleged Prototype Passages from the 1598 English Translation of Goslicius' *De Optimo Senatore*" (unpublished article).

[4] T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "Polonius, Poland, and Political Theory"; R. Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century*, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. 14, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1929; Jenkins's comments in *Hamlet* (Arden edition), *op.cit.*, 440–443.

[5] W. L. Rushton, *Shakespeare Illustrated by Old Authors*, Parts I and II, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1867–8. (I: 62–65, 70–72 etc.); *idem*, *Shakespeare's Euphuisms*, London 1871.

[6] T. J. Bałukówna, *op.cit.*, 163–173; T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "The Senator of Wawrzyniec Goślicki and the Elizabethan Counsellor," in *The Polish Renaissance in Its European Context*, S. Fiszman (ed.), foreword by Cz. Miłosz, Bloomington & Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 1988, 258–277, 262, 268–272.

cially sponsored by an undisclosed English patron for a specific, most probably diplomatic purpose. Goslicius's Latin original had been in circulation in England since at least the 1580's.[7]

3) We know nothing about the translator (or, more probably, translators) who produced the 1598 English version of *De Optimo Senatore*. However, the *Transcripts of the Stationers' Register* and other documents help in defining the professional identities of the booksellers involved. The only mention of this book in the *Register* is its entry, on 6th March 1598, to a William Blackman, whose only other record is for the *Aethiopica*.[8] But the printer involved was Richard Bradocke. In 1607 part of the same edition was re-issued with a new title page and title, *A Common-wealth of Good Counsaile, Or Policie's Chief Counseller*, letter dedicatory, and the name of a new copyright holder – the well-established stationer Nicholas Lyng,[9] with R.B. (evidently Bradocke) as his printer. Lyng and Bradocke had been promoted to the livery of the Stationers' Company on the same day, 1st July 1598 – just four months after the entry of *The Counsellor* into the Register.[10] It seems highly likely that they were aware that the text of *The Counsellor* had been pre-censored prior to publication (and most probably translation as well). In view of the doctoring of Goslicius's original text in L1598, conjectures put forward intermittently since the 1930's that copies of the translation had been "banned and burned" may be safely dismissed once and for all. There is nothing in the *Stationers' Register* to suggest the suppression of *The Counsellor*, although in the same period punitive measures were taken against several "satires," including some published by Lyng.[11] Lyng was one of the stationers involved in the publication of both the "Bad Quarto" of *Hamlet* (1603), as well as of Q2, just a year later (1604/5). If the Second Quarto is treated as the "legitimate" text, then it seems improbable that the playwright and/or his company should have entrusted its publication to stationers who had done business with dishonest interlopers just a year earlier, and caution should be exercised over the use of the epithet "Pirate Quarto" with respect to Q1 *Hamlet*. Incidentally, Bradocke was responsible for the printing of *The Hystorie of Hamlet* (1608), the de Belleforest translation.[12]

---

[7] Goslicius' opus was in circulation in England already by the 1580s and early 1590s, quoted by G. Harvey in *Pierces Supererogation* (1593), 114. There are extant manuscript translations of it, such as the one by Robert Chester, preserved in the British Library, Ms.Add. 18613 (1577–1586). The translation published in 1598 was made not later than the spring of 1584 – as evidenced by an extant manuscript preserved in University College Library (M.S. Ogden 14) dated 9 April and 23 May 1584 for Books 1 and 2 respectively. This manuscript does not have a translation of the original letter of dedication to Sigismundus Augustus.

[8] *Transcripts of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1620*, E. Arber (ed.), London 1875–1877, III, 105.

[9] For information on the life and professional activities of Nicholas Ling (Lyng) including his involvement in the publishing of Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet*, see G. D. Johnson, "Nicholas Ling, Publisher (1580–1607)," in *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 38, 1985, 203–214; *idem*, "John Trundle and the Book Trade (1603–1627)," in *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 39, 1986, 177–199. Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia and the Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccer-sb?id=sibv038&images=bsuva/sb/images&d (accessed January 2006).

[10] E. Arber II, *op.cit.*, 872–873; T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "The Senator," 265; G. D. Johnson, "Nicholas Ling," 206.

[11] E. Arber III, *op.cit.*, 677–678; G. D. Johnson, "Nicholas Ling," 209.

[12] See *Hamlet*, Variorum edition, II, 91; the other stationer involved was Thomas Pavier, who also held the copyrights to quarto editions of several Shakespeare plays.

4) In *The Elizabethan Stage* (1923) E. K. Chambers drew attention to the synchronicity of a diplomatic incident at Elizabeth's court in the summer of 1597, when a Polish ambassador, Paweł Działyński, representing the King of Poland and the City of Gdańsk, lodged a complaint against acts of piracy conducted on Polish (Gdańsk) shipping by Elizabeth's subjects and with her consent. The Queen's vitriolic reply in Latin was recorded and is preserved in several English archival sources.[13] Chambers notes the incident's proximity in time with the suppression of *The Isle of Dogs,* a (now lost) play by Thomas Nashe and Ben Jonson: "Apparently Nashe was accused of satirising some nobleman. But this was not the only point of attack. 'Out steps me an infant squib of the Innes of Court... and he, to approve himself an extravagant statesman, catcheth hold of a rush, and absolutely concludeth, it is meant of the Emperor of Ruscia, and that it will utterly marre the traffike into that country if all the Pamphlets bee not called in and suppressed, wherein that libelling word is mentioned.' I do not suppose that Nashe had literally called the Emperor of Russia a rush in *The Isle of Dogs,* but it is quite possible that he, or Ben Jonson, had called the King of Poland a pole."[14] It is thus highly probable that Ambassador Działyński, received in a public audience at Greenwich Palace on 28th July (old style)/4th August 1597, had provided the visual model and motive for the character of Polonius ("man from Polonia / Poland") – a reference to the repercussions, no doubt long remembered in the theatre world, following the staging of *The Isle of Dogs.* Below I shall indicate the connection with the garbled and maimed *Counsellor* of 1598.

5) In her informative book on stage censorship in the Elizabethan and early Jacobean period, Janet Clare writes that one of the situation types presented in plays which evoked censorship was satire on foreign kings and princes, and foreigners in general, which was likely to stir up xenophobic rioting.[15] On the other hand, satires on domestic subjects could be relegated to "a foreign location to avoid imputation of contemporary reference."[16] She also returns time and again to the subject of self-censorship – playwrights, actors, and theatre companies taking preventive measures to forestall the risk of censorship and possibly even suppression by a watchful Master of the Revels.[17] And fourthly, she observes that the opening years of James I's reign, until 1606, brought a spell of relative liberalisation in censorship.[18]

---

[13] *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series. Of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, 1595–1597. Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office*, M. A. Everett Green (ed.), London 1869, 473, 476, 481; Acts of the Privy Council of England New Series, vol. XXVII (A.D. 1597), J. R. Dasent (ed.), London 1903, 302, 307–308; W. Camden, 1717 edition, London, *Guillelmi Camdeni Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha. Tribus voluminibus comprehens, 1597*, 746–50, and on-line: http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/camden/1597e.html; W. B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I and Charles I, 1540–1646*, London 1853, vol. I: 437–440; *Original Letters Illustrative of English History including Numerous Royal Letters from Autographs in the British Museum, the State Paper Office and One or Two Other Collections*, H. Ellis (ed.), First Series, vol. 3, London 1969 (1827), Letter CCXXXIV, 41–46.

[14] E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage,* vols I–IV, Oxford University Press, 1923; III, 453–55; also 353–54, 298–99; II: 196; IV: 321–323.

[15] J. Clare, *'Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority.' Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*, Manchester University Press, 1990, 22, 57, 138–144.

[16] *Ibidem*, 86.

[17] *Ibidem*, 14, 67, 108, 212–214. See also M. Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre. Plays in Performance*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982, 42– 44, 90.

[18] J. Clare, *op.cit.*, 98–99.

6) Alongside the English archival materials documenting the Działyński embassy (and particularly the letter penned by Robert Cecil on the Queen's intimation to the Earl of Essex),[19] there are surviving Polish records, in particular various copies of *Mercurius Sarmaticus*, which was compiled and circulated on the Ambassador's initiative. Several copies survive, including one in the Czartoryski Library, Krakow, and what is probably the autograph together with the official reply delivered to Działyński, signed by Burghley, Robert Cecil, and Fortesque, in the Kórnik Library. *Mercurius Sarmaticus* warrants publication with an English translation for the benefit of Shakespeare scholars. Most significantly for the present purposes, it contains two references to the public disturbances which erupted in London in outcome of the Ambassador's speech. The first is a remark by the Ambassador's reporter on the threats to his safety: "The [Queen's] subjects do not refrain from various kinds of offensive conduct against the Ambassador; the people are in turmoil, calling for punishment for the slur against Her Majesty. Merchants from the Hansa station warn him to beware of poison, while the innkeeper for some unknown reason loses confidence and advises him to leave the inn. No longer does any Englishman dare invite the Ambassador to his house..."[20] The second is from the advice given Działyński by Burghley's servant Parkins, who comes to deliver the Privy Council's reply to the King of Poland, "But I warn you as a friend not to stay in England any longer on account of the rioting. You see how all the people are incensed when their Queen feels offended. Take heed not to give any cause for an accusation to be brought against you."[21] Thus the Polish archival records corroborate Chambers's conjecture about *The Isle of Dogs* entailing a satirical item against the Polish Ambassador and perhaps also his royal master, and they also tally with Janet Clare's observations on the censoring of plays attacking foreign dignitaries, indicating the problems the English authorities had with controlling such outbursts of popular discontent.

7) It has to be remembered that not only was Działyński the envoy of the King of Poland, but he was also representing the City of Gdańsk, which while a member of the Hanseatic League, was within the dominions of the King of Poland. Thanks to a grand research project directed and accomplished in recent years by Jerzy Limon,[22] we know that by the turn of the century Gdańsk was a regular fixture on the Continental itinerary of "strolling English players," and that by 1612 English plays were being performed there in a theatre newly built following the architectural model of the Fortune. Thus it comes as no surprise that in Cohn's edition of the German versions of English plays the king's counsellor of *Der bestrafte Brudermord* is named "Corambus," not "Polonius."

---

[19] W. Camden, *op.cit.*; *Original...*, First Series, vol. 3, Letter CCXXXIV, 41–46; W. B. Devereux, *op.cit.*, I: 437–440.

[20] *Merkuriusz Sarmacki z Niderlandów i Anglii czyli zwięzła relacja z dwóch poselstw..., które... sprawował Paweł Działyński... 1597*, R. Marciniak (ed.), I. Horbowy (trans.), Wrocław: Ossolineum, Polska Akademia Nauk & Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1978, 38. Contains a facsimile of a contemporary relation in Latin of the 1597 Działyński Embassy; MS in the Teki Naruszewicza Collection, the Czartoryski Library (Biblioteka XX Czartoryskich), Kraków (my translation into English – T.B.U.).

[21] *Ibidem*, 48.

[22] J. Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company. English Players in Central and Eastern Europe 1590–1660*, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 37–38; also Z. Stříbný, *Eastern Europe in Shakespeare*, Oxford University Press, 2000, 10–17, 24–25.

And we have a patent reason for such a decision: it was simply not in the wandering players' interest either economically or from the point of view of reputation and prestige to present anything which could, and would, have been taken as a satire on their European patrons. I shall try to show that there might have been similar motives behind the choice of the name "Corambis" for the character in Q1 *Hamlet*.

8) Long before Gollancz's remarks on the perceived connection between Polonius in the play and *The Counsellor* of 1598, and years later as well, other Shakespearean commentators were putting forward hypotheses that Polonius was in fact a satire on William Cecil, Lord Burghley.[23] In the 1982 and 1992 Arden editions of *Hamlet* Harold Jenkins calls such notions "conjecture" and is not particularly convinced about the Goslicius connection.[24] But of course *all* satire is a matter of conjecture: under a regime as repressive as the one which decided the fate of Shakespeare and his colleagues' theatre, the availability of *absolute proof* would have had disastrous consequences for them. The very suspicion of a phenomenon as ephemeral and hermetic as satire – after the lapse of several centuries – is perception enough, I think, and needs no more rigorous a QED. Similarly, G. R. Hibbard's notion that the names "Polonius" and "Reynaldo" were intended to allude to Oxonian celebrities[25] neither sets aside nor is set aside by the Goslicius/Działyński theory, since again elusiveness and ambiguity, putting would-be bloodhounds on a multiplicity of trails, none of them necessarily right or wrong, are in the very nature of satire. In the eyes of their political adversaries at home (the Essex faction), Burghley and his son Robert Cecil, who was requested by Elizabeth to write a report to Essex of her triumph over the "braving Polart,"[26] might have appeared implicated in the Ambassador affair, since they and their servants had attended to the Ambassador's needs, which it was their duty to do anyway. More importantly, though, in January of the following year Robert Cecil took pains on Elizabeth's behalf to achieve conciliation and reach a compromise solution with Poland. His servant George Carew sent to that country reported the compilation and circulation of *Mercurius Sarmaticus*.[27] This is why I see Robert Cecil as the unnamed patron of the English version of Goslicius's *De Optimo Senatore*, published and officially promoted – I believe – as part of that campaign of reconciliation. There is a printed record extant for 1599/1600 by the Polish historiographer and political writer Krzysztof Warszewicki (Varsevicius) complimenting Goslicius on the popularity of his book in England.[28] We do not know whether Varsevicius meant the original Latin of Goslicius's treatise or its

[23] G. Russell French, *Shakespeareana Genealogia*, London 1869, 301; L. Winstanley, *Hamlet and the Scottish Succession*, Cambridge Univeristy Press, 1921, 109–128. http://www.sourcetext.com/sourcebook/library/winstanley/hamlet/5.htm and A. Lefranc, *A la découverte de Shakespeare*, Paris 1945, 289–310. For a more recent recapitulation of work on the Hamlet/Essex relation, see J. Lull, "Forgetting *Hamlet*: The First Quarto and the Folio," in *The* Hamlet *First Published (Q1, 1603). Origins, Form, Intertextualities*, T. Clayton (ed.), Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992, 137–150, especially 138–141.

[24] *Hamlet* (Arden edition), 421–422.

[25] Hibbard quoted by A. C. Dessen, "Weighing the Options in Hamlet Q1," in *The* Hamlet *First Published*, 65–78, 77; and K. Irace, "Origins and Agents of Q1 *Hamlet*," *ibidem*, 90–122, 107, 122.

[26] W. B. Devereux, *op.cit.*, notes 13 and 19.

[27] *Merkuriusz sarmacki*, 11–12.

[28] Christophori Varsevicii Canonici Cracoviensis *De Cognitione Sui Ipsius Libri tres...*, Cracoviae, Anno Dnĩ M.DC: f. 202–203 – a dedicatory letter to Goslicius, dated 15 August 1600.

L1598 English version. What is intriguing about the remark is that Varsevicius was a Habsburg agent, and of course the crucial backdrop to the Działyński affair was that his English hosts suspected the Ambassador of covertly representing the interests of Philip II.[29] The intercepting of Gdańsk shipping had been done to prevent it from reaching Spanish destinations. In the minds and memories of first- and second-hand witnesses of the Działyński embassy, the figure of Polonius could well have connected not only with the Polish Ambassador, but also with the man directly responsible for his reception, Burghley, his son and his servants. And for the people of the theatre – also with the unforgettably ominous *The Isle of Dogs* and consequent threat to their livelihood. Satire is never directed at astrally remote targets, but at the close-at-hand if cloaked familiar.

9) In my final point I would like to return to philological comparison at a more in-depth level. Certain passages from the garbled text of L1598 give an eerie echo of some of the obscure jokes in *Hamlet*, particularly in its Q2 variant. Significantly, these lexical motifs are recurrent in L1598 to a degree which would have made them memorable on private reading, and even more so on public declamation.

The lengthy passage from p. 88–89 of L1598 I quote for the comparative analysis of the Precepts has drawn the attention of several researchers[30] for its uncanny parallel to Hamlet's epitaph to Polonius: "Indeed this counsellor / Is now most still, most secret, and most grave, / Who was in life a foolish prating knave." (F/Q2: III, iv, 213–215) But the point is that similar epithets of the Wise Counsellor occur in *The Counsellor* of 1598 at a remarkably high frequency, such that even a casual reader or listener of its oral delivery could not fail to notice. On the first two pages there are as many as 9 instances of adjectival and substantive phrases qualifying the word "Councellor."[31]

A similar phenomenon may be observed for Hamlet's sardonic remark about Alexander in V, i: "Why may not imagination trace the noble dust of Alexander, till he find it stopping a bung-hole?" (Q2/F: 192–193, adapted in Q1). Alexander was a popular figure in the mirror-books. Goslicius' treatise accords him no less than 9 anecdotal presentations, none of them referring directly to death (unlike the passage in Lucian cited by Jenkins).[32] But several of them, when juxtaposed with Hamlet's words, endow

[29] *Merkuriusz sarmacki*, 11–12.

[30] See I. Gollancz, *op.cit.*, "Bits of Timber," 177; W. Chwalewik, *Anglo-Polish Renaissance Texts for the Use of Shakespeare Students*, Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1968 (contains a facsimile of L1598), 45–203, 34; also T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "Polonius, Poland...," 3.

[31] The following epithets of "Councellor" occur on pages 1 and 2 of *The Counsellor* (1598): • a perfect Councellor; • wise lawmakers and grave Councellors; • In the person of our Councellor, there shoulde be such ripenesse of age as might exercise the vertues beseeming so honourable a personage and in his calling, holde so greate a grauitie and reputation, as all other Citizens and subiectes may hope at his hande to receive comfort ...; • the qualetie and perfection of a Councellor; • And we will, that the vertue of our Councell be such, as are not onelie profitable for the gouerment of one state, but shall be of that excelencie as the same may be practised in the proceedings of all others. For we have learned of Plato, that those commonweales be moste happie, which are gouerned by Phylosophers, or where the gouernours are wholly disposed to the study of Philosophie. Therefore from such a wise man, and such a Ciuill Science, we haue determined to take matter, whereof to frame our excellent Councellor.

[32] Jenkins in *Hamlet* (Arden edition), 387. Other examples from Goslicius: Alexander of Macedon with his small hand conquered great enemies (Ven. f. 11A; L1598, p. 20); Alexander being asked where he would haue his treasure preserued: answered, among his friends, because he thought, good will to be the

Shakespeare's text with an aura of the surreal. Here is just one of these items: "Many most notable men haue taken pleasure in trauelle, as *Nestor*, *Menelaus*, and *Alexander* the great."[33]

In other publications I present the grotesque echo of Hamlet's "the king is a thing ..." (IV, ii, 26 – in Q2 but not Q1, and with the addendum "Hide, fox, and all after" in F) in the tiresome repetitiveness of L1598;[34] and another L1598 citation as a gruesome shadow of Hamlet's apparently incoherent rambling on the emperor or king, the beggar, the fish and the worm in the next scene (IV, iii – present in Q1, Q2 as well as F)[35] – all utterances which are to be taken as evidence of Hamlet's madness. In the same scene Hamlet refuses to call Claudius "Father:" "father and mother is man and wife, man and wife is one flesh, and so, my mother" (50–51: present in Q2 and F, with a more explicit version in Q1). While Jenkins notes the biblical references for this supposed proof of Hamlet's madness,[36] as far as I know none of the critics have associated it with the ubiquitous Aristotelian metaphor of the forms of government, for educated Elizabethans a natural reference. The reading of an analogous passage in *The Counsellor* as a background opens up a new depth to the hitherto rather obscure sense of this "mad" apostrophe, suggesting that Hamlet's real meaning is a denial of Claudius's kingship and insistence that the man plotting to kill him is a tyrant with no monarchical authority:

> Aristotle doth also write, that the image of commonweales, may be found in priuate families. For the authoritie of the father ouer his children, may be likened to principalitie: because the children are the fathers charge. He alone must prouide for them all, and their faultes are by him rather chastised then seuerely punished. Therefore *Iupiter* the God of Gods and men is by Homer called *Father*. The husbandes authoritie ouer his wife may be compared to the *Optimatie*. For the husband ought to gouerne his wife according to iustice, and commaunde her to do things honest. The popular state is likened to brotherly societie. For they ought to liue in equality, differing onely in the degrees of age. But as the Father that vseth his children wickedly, cruelly and unnaturally, is reputed a tyrant and no father: Even so a king that studieth for his priuate commodity oppressing his subiectes, contemning his lawes, and liuing dishonourably, doth lose the name of a king and is called a Tyrante. Also a husband and wife liuing in discorde, eyther through negligence or wilfulnesse reiecting the care of their children and householde, doe thereby abuse their authoritie and become unworthy the name of natural parentes [...] (L1598, p. 10; cf. Ven. f. 5r)

There are many more such reminiscences in *The Counsellor* of lines from *Hamlet*, opening up a chasm of grotesque interpretations, many of them allusions to the political concepts of the times. Suffice the ones presented above to illustrate the relationship – one far more complex than simple philological comparison could reveal, and depend-

owner both of his, and other mens riches (Ven. f. 79v; L1598, p. 148–149); the felicitie of Diogenes was farre other, then the felicitie of great Alexander: one was poore, the other rich: the whole world could not suffice the one, the other was contented with a silly cabin (Ven. f. 78r; L1598, p. 146).

[33] Ven. f. 26v; L1598, p. 50.

[34] T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "Slanders by the Satirical Knave Holding the Mirror up to Nature: the Background to Wawrzyniec Goślicki as One of Shakespeare's Sources for 'Hamlet'," in *Literature and Language in the Intertextual and Cultural Context*, M. Gibińska & Z. Mazur (eds), Krakow: Jagiellonian University Press, 1994, 27–39, 30.

[35] T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, "Polonius, Poland...," 10–11.

[36] Jenkins in *Hamlet* (Arden edition), 342.

ent on the historical background and the fact that by the close of the century the English theatre tradition had become a European phenomenon. If my conclusion about the reflection of the Działyński embassy in the choice of the name "Polonius" for the character is correct, then this would determine the *terminus post quem* for the appearance of "Polonius" on the stage at the end of 1597, and if the observed allusions, mainly in Q2, to *The Counsellor* hold, this would suggest the earliest date for the creation and/or modification of these lines as mid-1598, which would tie up with the dating for Q2 put forward by Harold Jenkins and Kathleen Irace,[37] possibly shifting back a little the potential time of origin for "Polonius." Secondly, if "Polonius" was an aftermath and souvenir of *The Isle of Dog*s affair and the closure of the theatres in 1597, this would give the theatre allusions in *Hamlet* an extra dimension, augmenting the widely-known lampoon on the children's companies involved in the "War of the Theatres." Thirdly, the synchronicity of the Działyński embassy and *The Isle of Dogs* affair provides an insight into the extent of on-stage improvisation and both the risk of recrimination as well as the chances of a daredevil play's survival. Perhaps the decision to name the character "Polonius" was prompted by the anti-Polish tide in public opinion; perhaps – following the experience of the compulsory Oldcastle/Falstaff name-change – it designated a convenient smokescreen for a caricature of Old Cecil in connection with the Działyński incident. In my opinion the Polonius/Corambis name-change may signify the coexistence of several versions of the play on the stage, performed according to what was expedient and required, and again indicates the occurrence of improvisation. While it is highly likely that "Polonius" was the character's original name in the Shakespearean play, "Corambis" might have been inherited from the *Ur-Hamlet* tradition, to be revived in Q1 and *Der bestrafte Brudermord.* If this is the case, then it is high time to put aside the term "pirate quarto" with respect to the Q1 printing of *Hamlet.* By analogy to what happened in the play's Continental German version and for similar reasons, in or after 1598 the playwright, actors and company could well have compiled a printed, legitimate version of the play with the "safe" name "Corambis" as a form of self-censorship to protect their artistic and economic interests. During the brief spell of liberalised censorship in the new reign, and within barely a year from the issue of Q1, the same agency proceeded to publish a fuller version, Q2, quite logically resorting to the services of the same stationer.

[37] Jenkins in *Hamlet* (Arden edition), 1–7; K. Irace, *op.cit.*, 117–121.